Case 2:05-cv-00583-RCJ-LRL Document 106 Filed 05/17/13 Page 1 of 4

Case 2:05-cv-00583-RCJ-LRL Document 104 Filed \$\infty 5/02/13 Page 5 of 8 **FILED** RECEIVED **ENTERED** SERVED ON COUNSEL/PARTIES OF RECORD 1 2 MAY 1 7 2013 3 CLERK US DISTRICT COURT 4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA BY: DEPUTY 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 10 11 GYPSUM RESOURCES, LLC, a No. CV-S-05-0583-RCI-LRL 12 Nevada limited liability company, Plaintiff, 13 **建约理事 IUDGMENT** 14 VS. CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO, in 15 her official capacity as Attorney General of the State of Nevada and her agents and successors; 16 DAVID ROGER, in his official 17 capacity as District Attorney of the County of Clark and his agents and successors; COUNTY OF CLARK, a 18 political subdivision of the State of 19 Nevada; BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF THE 20 COUNTY OF CLARK; and DOES 1-75, 21 Defendants. 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW [Proposed] Judgment LOS ANGELES

<u>JUDGMENT</u>

This action came on for hearing on the motions for summary judgment filed by Plaintiff Gypsum Resources, LLC ("Gypsum") (Doc. #42), by Defendants David Roger, in his official capacity as District Attorney of the County of Clark and his agents and successors, County of Clark, and Board of County Commissioners of the County of Clark (collectively "County Defendants") (Doc. #43), and by Defendant Catherine Cortez Masto, in her official capacity as Attorney General of the State of Nevada and her agents and successors ("the State") (Doc. #44) on November 9, 2009.

On November 24, 2009, the Court issued its Order granting the motion for summary judgment filed by Gypsum on the Fourth and Fifth Causes of Action, invalidating Nevada Senate Bill No. 358 as unconstitutional under Article 4 Sections 20, 21, and 25 of the Nevada constitution. (Doc. #70.)

On December 22, 2009, the State filed an interlocutory appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals from the Court's November 24, 2009 Order (Doc. #73).

On April 22, 2010, the Court dismissed as moot Gypsum's remaining claim against the State (Gypsum's First Cause of Action), pending the outcome of the State's interlocutory appeal, and subject to revival depending on the outcome of the State's interlocutory appeal (Doc. #86).

On June 9, 2010, the Court ordered dismissal of the County Defendants (Doc. #93) pursuant to the Stipulation and Settlement Agreement Pursuant to Court Ordered Settlement Conference (Doc. #92), leaving the State as the only remaining defendant in this action.

On March 7, 2013, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals issued its Amended Mandate on the State's appeal. On March 8, 2013, the Court issued its Amended

The State's interlocutory appeal having been finally resolved, it is now

appropriate to enter Judgment in this action pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.Pro. 58.

Order on Mandate (Doc. #100).

2

3

4

Accordingly,

5 6

7

8 9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

1. For the reasons stated in the Court's November 24, 2009 Order (Doc.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:

- #70), the Court finds and declares that Nevada Senate Bill 358, the "Red Rock Canyon Conservation Area and Adjacent Lands Act" (Act of May 19, 2003, ch. 105, 2003 Nev. Stat. 595) ("SB 358"), is unconstitutional under Article 4 Sections 20, 21, and 25 of the Nevada constitution, and the State is hereby enjoined from enforcing SB 358.
- 2. Plaintiff Gypsum's right to recover attorneys' fees against the State shall be determined on motion to be filed pursuant to the Stipulation and Order re Briefing Schedule on Motion for Attorneys' Fees by Plaintiff Gypsum Resources Against Defendant State, filed on March 16, 2013 (Doc. # 102).
- 3. Plaintiff Gypsum's right to recover costs against the State shall be determined by cost bill to be filed pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.Pro. 54(d) and Local Rule 54-1.
- 4. Plaintiff Gypsum shall recover from defendant State post-judgment interest from the date of entry of Judgment until the date this Judgment, and any sums awarded pursuant to it, is paid in full, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1961, compounded annually.

2

Case 2:05-cv-00583-RCJ-LRL Document 106 Filed 05/17/13 Page 4 of 4

. •	Case 2:05-cv-00583-RCJ-LRL Document 104 Filed 05/02/13 Page 8 of 8
1	Pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.Pro. 58(b)(2)(B), the Court hereby approves the form
2	of the Judgment set forth above and directs the clerk to promptly enter the
3	Judgment.
4	
5	\sim
6	Janes
7	HON. ROBERT Q. JONES
8	United States Chief District Judge
9	·
10	Dated: This 17th day of May, 2013.
11	
12	
13	
14	CLERK
15	307837129.1
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28 MANATT, PHELPS &	3
PHILLIPS, LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW	[Proposed] Judgment

Los Angeles